

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Amtd. Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No. 26021

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated August 9, 2005. Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1, 7-8 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Epson (OLE for Retail POS – Application Programmer’s Guide). Claims 2-6, 9-13 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Epson in view of US Patent No. 6,741,558 B1 (Gresham). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that the claims herein are patentable in light of the clarifying amendments above and the arguments below.

The Epson Reference

The Epson reference (OLE for Retail POS – Application Programmer’s Guide) provides guidance to application developers and hardware providers relating to OPOS controls. The OPOS control has a Service Object that passes information to a Control Object by reporting events. (*See, Epson; Page 11*). The Service Object reports a status change data that indicates a change in device status. Epson refers to this function as StatusUpdateEvent, which reports a change in the device’s status. (*See, Epson; Page 22*).

The Gresham Reference

Gresham is directed to an event detector that detects a plurality of different possible asynchronous events from any of a plurality of source addresses and nodes,

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Amdt. Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No. 26021

debounces the event and, once a valid event has been identified and confirmed, formats and transmits a message via a message transport system to a predetermined destination address for further appropriate action. Each event is time-stamped so that latency in the message transport system does not affect time-critical events. Thus, the transmitted message identifies the source address, source node, an event number for identifying the event, and a time-stamp associated with the event.. (*See, Gresham, Col. 1, lines 45-56*).

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The present application is generally directed to a device status monitoring system and method for a data processing system.

As defined by amended independent Claim 1, a device status monitoring system in a data processing system includes a peripheral device connected to a host computer. The host computer runs an operating system and an application capable of controlling the peripheral device. The host computer includes a device control system for controlling the peripheral device through the operating system. The device control system includes a first object providing a device class interface to the application and a second object providing an interface for the peripheral device to the first object. The device status monitoring system includes a status change data recording unit in the second object for continuously recording status change data indicating each sequential change in a device status to a status change recording unit.

The applied references do not disclose or suggest the above features of the present invention as defined by amended independent Claim 1. In particular, the applied references do not disclose or suggest a, "device status monitoring system comprising: a status change data recording unit in the second object for continuously recording status change data indicating each sequential change in a

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Amtd. Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No. 26021

device status to a status change recording unit," as required by amended independent Claim 1.

On page 22, Epson discloses a function that reports status change data to indicate a change in device status as StatusUpdateEvent, which reports a change in the device's status. (*See, Epson; Page 22*).

In contrast, independent Claim 1, as amended, requires the status change data recording unit in the second object to continuously record status change data, which indicates each sequential change in a device status to a status change recording unit. This claimed features allows the device status monitoring system of the present invention to continuously and sequential record, by means of a second object of a device control system, status change data that indicates a change in a particular device status to a status change recording unit as a log file. (*See Specification, Page 3, lines 7-28*).

Accordingly, the applied Epson reference does not disclose or suggest this feature of the present invention as required by the claims.

The ancillary Gresham reference does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Epson.

Since the applied references do not disclose or suggest the above features of the present invention as required by amended independent Claim 1, those references cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of that claim.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8 and 16, as amended, are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to amended independent Claim 1.

The remaining Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-18 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 and recite additional features of the invention

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Amtd. Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No. 26021

which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references, and are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6809 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: October 5, 2005

By: 

Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)